

Kondo Effects in Quantum Dots at Large Bias

Yu-Wen Lee¹ and Yu-Li Lee²

¹*Department of Physics, National Taiwan University, Taipei, Taiwan, Republic of China*

²*Institute of Physics, Academia Sinica, Taipei, Taiwan, Republic of China*

(Dated: Received 10 September 2001)

Recently, the issue of whether the Kondo problem in quantum dots at large bias is a weak-coupling problem or not has been raised. In this paper, we revisit this problem by carefully analyzing a corresponding model in the solvable limit — the Emery-Kivelson line, where various crossover energy scales can be easily identified. We then try to extract the scaling behavior of this problem from various physical correlation functions within the spirit of “poor man’s scaling.” Our conclusions support some recent suggestions made by Coleman *et al.* [Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 4088 (2001)], which are obtained by perturbative analysis: The voltage acts as a cutoff of the renormalization group flow for *only* half of the impurity so that the low-temperature physics is controlled by a strong-coupling fixed point. But the low-temperature response functions in general show one-channel Kondo behaviors with two-channel Kondo behaviors occurring only through proximity to a quantum critical point.

PACS numbers: 73.63.Kv, 72.10.Fk, 72.15.Qm

I. INTRODUCTION

The Kondo problem is one of the best studied many-body problems in condensed matter physics. Due to advances of nanotechnology, the Kondo effect in quantum dot systems predicted by theories¹ was observed in recent experiments.² Although the quantum dot is intrinsically a multilevel system, as the energy is much lower than the single-particle level spacing, the system can be described by a single-impurity Anderson model with the level spacing playing the role of cutoff in this model. Moreover, in the Coulomb blockade regime with an odd number of electrons, it can be mapped onto a two-lead Kondo model with the following Hamiltonian:³

$$\begin{aligned} H &= \sum_{\alpha\mathbf{k}\sigma} \varepsilon_{\alpha\mathbf{k}} c_{\alpha\mathbf{k}\sigma}^\dagger c_{\alpha\mathbf{k}\sigma} + H_{\text{refl}} + H_{\text{trans}}, \\ H_{\text{refl}} &= J_R \sum_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{k}', \sigma, \sigma'} \left(c_{R\mathbf{k}\sigma}^\dagger \vec{\sigma}_{\sigma\sigma'} c_{R\mathbf{k}'\sigma'} \right) \cdot \vec{S} + (R \rightarrow L), \\ H_{\text{trans}} &= J_{LR} \sum_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{k}', \sigma, \sigma'} \left(c_{L\mathbf{k}\sigma}^\dagger \vec{\sigma}_{\sigma\sigma'} c_{R\mathbf{k}'\sigma'} \right) \cdot \vec{S} + (R \leftrightarrow L) \end{aligned}$$

Here, $c_{\alpha\mathbf{k}\sigma}^\dagger$ creates an electron in lead $\alpha \in \{L, R\}$ with momentum $\mathbf{k}$ and spin σ , and J_L , J_R , and $J_{LR}(=J_{RL})$ are positive (antiferromagnetic) Kondo coupling constants between electrons and the dot ($\vec{S}$). Energies $\varepsilon_{\alpha\mathbf{k}} = \varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}} - eV_\alpha$, where $V_\alpha = \pm V/2$ are the potentials of the left- and right-hand leads. Besides, derived from an Anderson model via a Schrieffer-Wolff transformation³, the coupling constants obey $|J_{LR}|^2 = J_L J_R$.

Within the spirit of “poor man’s scaling,” a recent paper by Kaminski *et al.*,³ shows that even in the present nonequilibrium case, the low-temperature properties can still be characterized by a *single* crossover energy scale T_K which is identified as the Kondo temperature of this problem. Through extending the information gained from perturbative renormalization group (RG) equations,

Kaminski *et al.*, use the ordinary one-channel Kondo fixed point to extract low-temperature transport properties for $V \ll T_K$. However, for $V \geq T_K$, the RG-improved perturbative calculation indicates that the conductance will saturate at a value much smaller than that in the unitary limit. This signals that the coupling between different leads J_{LR} stops growing for energy smaller than V . One then wonders whether the above-mentioned one-channel Kondo (1CK) fixed point can still be used to describe the low-temperature physics in the latter case. Recently, to gain further insight into this problem, Coleman *et al.*,⁴ have done a perturbative calculation of the impurity magnetic susceptibility. The scaling behaviors for various couplings they obtained are basically the same as that obtained in Ref. 3 in the high-temperature region. However, for $T \ll V$, the flows of $J_{L,R}$ and J_{LR} exhibit different behaviors: J_{LR} stops growing at the energy scale V while $J_{L,R}$ continue to grow toward strong coupling with a new Kondo temperature T_K^* . They conjecture that the physics at $T < T_K^*$ is described by a 2CK fixed point. (See also Ref. 5.)

In this paper, we shall revisit this problem by studying the model in a solvable limit — the generalized Emery-Kivelson line.⁶ This enables us to follow the RG flow all the way from the perturbative regime down to the low-temperature region, and the concept of universality guarantees that we can obtain correct scaling at low temperature. Moreover, through studying various correlation functions in details, we can see how the impurity is screened (or unscreened) due to the presence of finite bias. This approach is complementary to the perturbative analysis in Ref. 4, which is supposed to be valid at high temperature. Combined with the results obtained from the perturbation theory, we reach a complete picture about the behavior of the Hamiltonian (1) at large bias: The effect of the cotunneling term H_{trans} is to generate a new energy scale Γ_{LR} even in the *channel-symmetric* case ($J_L = J_R$). As $\Gamma_{LR} \ll T_K$, there exists

a range of temperature $\Gamma_{LR} \ll T \ll T_K$, where the uniform magnetic susceptibility exhibits the 2CK behavior, i.e., the logarithmic temperature dependence. On the contrary, it will show the 1CK behavior as $\Gamma_{LR} \approx T_K$. This is the fundamental difference between the present case and the ordinary 2CK fixed point. Previous studies on ordinary 2CK problems⁷ revealed that the presence of an *unscreened* Majorana fermion lies at the heart of the 2CK properties, which is the origin of the logarithmic temperature dependence in various susceptibilities. In our case, the logarithmic temperature dependence is due to the *partial* screening of a Majorana fermion. Although the low-temperature behavior of the uniform susceptibility is similar to that in the ordinary channel-asymmetric 2CK problem ($J_L \neq J_R$ and $H_{trans} = 0$) and there are two characteristic energy scales in both cases, the origins are distinct. In the ordinary channel-asymmetric 2CK problem, the new energy scale in addition to the Kondo temperature is generated from the channel-asymmetry, i.e., $J_L \neq J_R$, whereas in our case it arises from H_{trans} and still exists even $J_L = J_R$.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. We introduce the solvable model in Sec. II. In Sec. III, the impurity Green functions and the impurity contributions to the uniform magnetic susceptibility are calculated. The last section is devoted to a discussion and conclusions of our results.

II. THE SOLVABLE MODEL

After changing the notation $R(L) \rightarrow 1(2)$, we start with the following Hamiltonian:^{9,10}

$$H = H_0 + H_1 + H_2,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} H_0 &= \sum_{\alpha, \sigma} \int dx : \psi_{\alpha\sigma}^\dagger (i\partial_x - V_\alpha) \psi_{\alpha\sigma} : , \\ H_1 &= \hat{S}_z \sum_{\alpha} \lambda_{\alpha\parallel} \psi_{\alpha}^\dagger \frac{\sigma_3}{2} \psi_{\alpha}(0) \\ &\quad + \left(\hat{S}^+ \sum_{\alpha} \frac{\lambda_{\alpha\perp}}{2} \psi_{\alpha}^\dagger \sigma_- \psi_{\alpha}(0) + \text{H.c.} \right) , \\ H_2 &= \lambda_{LR\parallel} \hat{S}_z \psi_2^\dagger \frac{\sigma_3}{2} \psi_1(0) + \frac{\lambda_{LR\perp}}{2} \left[\hat{S}^\dagger \psi_2^\dagger \sigma_- \psi_1(0) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \hat{S}^- \psi_2^+ \sigma_+ \psi_1(0) \right] + \text{H.c.} . \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

Here $\alpha = 1, 2$, $\sigma = \uparrow, \downarrow$, and $V_2 = -V_1 = V/2$. For simplicity, we set $e = 1$ and the Fermi velocity $v_F = 1$ and $: \cdots :$ is the normal ordering with respect to the Fermi surface in the absence of V . (Here we assume that Fermi velocities on both leads are equal.)

The procedure to arrive at a solvable model is given in the following. First we have to bosonize the Hamiltonian (2). To deal with Klein factors carefully, we employ

bosonization formulas on a finite length:¹²

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_{\alpha\sigma}(x) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi a_0}} F_{\alpha\sigma} \exp \{ -i\Delta_L (\hat{N}_{\alpha\sigma} - P_0/2)x \} \\ &\quad \times \exp \{ -i\sqrt{4\pi}\phi_{\alpha\sigma} \}, \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where $\hat{N}_{\alpha\sigma}$ is the number of $\psi_{\alpha\sigma}$ fermions and $\Delta_L = 2\pi/L$. Here L is the system size and a_0 is a short-distance cutoff. P_0 takes care of the boundary conditions of fermion fields. $F_{\alpha\sigma}$'s are Klein factors, which satisfy the commutation relations $[F_{\alpha\sigma}, \hat{N}_{\alpha'\sigma'}] = \delta_{\alpha\alpha'}\delta_{\sigma\sigma'}F_{\alpha\sigma}$, $\{F_{\alpha\sigma}, F_{\alpha'\sigma'}^\dagger\} = 2\delta_{\alpha\alpha'}\delta_{\sigma\sigma'}$, and $\{F_{\alpha\sigma}, F_{\alpha'\sigma'}\} = 0$. Next four bosonic fields are introduced⁷ by

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_c &= \frac{1}{2}(\phi_{1\uparrow} + \phi_{1\downarrow} + \phi_{2\uparrow} + \phi_{2\downarrow}), \\ \phi_s &= \frac{1}{2}(\phi_{1\uparrow} - \phi_{1\downarrow} + \phi_{2\uparrow} - \phi_{2\downarrow}), \\ \phi_f &= \frac{1}{2}(\phi_{1\uparrow} + \phi_{1\downarrow} - \phi_{2\uparrow} - \phi_{2\downarrow}), \\ \phi_{sf} &= \frac{1}{2}(\phi_{1\uparrow} - \phi_{1\downarrow} - \phi_{2\uparrow} + \phi_{2\downarrow}), \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

and the corresponding transformation on $\hat{N}_{\alpha\sigma}$ is

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{N}_c &= \frac{1}{2}(\hat{N}_{1\uparrow} + \hat{N}_{1\downarrow} + \hat{N}_{2\uparrow} + \hat{N}_{2\downarrow}), \\ \hat{N}_s &= \frac{1}{2}(\hat{N}_{1\uparrow} - \hat{N}_{1\downarrow} + \hat{N}_{2\uparrow} - \hat{N}_{2\downarrow}), \\ \hat{N}_f &= \frac{1}{2}(\hat{N}_{1\uparrow} + \hat{N}_{1\downarrow} - \hat{N}_{2\uparrow} - \hat{N}_{2\downarrow}), \\ \hat{N}_{sf} &= \frac{1}{2}(\hat{N}_{1\uparrow} - \hat{N}_{1\downarrow} - \hat{N}_{2\uparrow} + \hat{N}_{2\downarrow}). \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

Here $\hat{N}_m \in \mathcal{Z} + P/2$ for $m = c, s, f, sf$ and $\sum_m \hat{N}_m = 0 \bmod 2$. $P = 0, 1$ for the total number of fermions being even and odd integers, respectively. After plugging these into the Hamiltonian (2), we perform the Emery-Kivelson (EK) transformation: $U = \exp \{ i\sqrt{4\pi}\hat{S}_z\phi_s(0) \}$. To proceed, we also introduce four more Klein factors F_m with $m = c, s, f, sf$, which satisfy the commutation relation: $[F_m, \hat{N}_{m'}] = \delta_{mm'}F_m$. With the help of Eq. (5), the identification between $F_{\alpha\sigma}$ and F_m can be found. What we need is the following ones: $F_{1\uparrow}^\dagger F_{1\uparrow} = F_s F_{sf}$, $F_{2\downarrow}^\dagger F_{2\downarrow} = F_s F_{sf}^\dagger$, $F_{2\downarrow}^\dagger F_{1\uparrow} = F_f F_s$, and $F_{2\uparrow}^\dagger F_{1\downarrow} = F_f F_s^\dagger$. Then, the EK-transformed Hamiltonian is reformed by the following formulas:

$$\begin{aligned} d^\dagger &\equiv F_s \hat{S}^+, \quad d \equiv F_s^\dagger \hat{S}^-, \\ \hat{S}_z &= d^\dagger d - 1/2, \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_m(x) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi a_0}} F_m \exp \{ -i\Delta_L (\hat{N}_m - 1/2)x \} \\ &\quad \times \exp \{ -i\sqrt{4\pi}\phi_m \}, \quad m = f, sf, \\ \Psi_s(x) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi a_0}} F_s e^{i\pi d^\dagger d} \exp \{ -i\Delta_L (\hat{S}_T - 1/2)x \} \\ &\quad \times \exp \{ -i\sqrt{4\pi}\phi_s \}, \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

with $\hat{S}_T = \hat{S}_z + \hat{N}_s$ being the total spin operator. Finally, the structure of the Hamiltonian can be further simplified by introducing Majorana fermions

$$\begin{aligned}\xi_m^1 &= \frac{\Psi_m + \Psi_m^\dagger}{\sqrt{2}}, \quad \xi_m^2 = \frac{\Psi_m - \Psi_m^\dagger}{\sqrt{2}i}, \quad m = f, sf, \\ a &= \frac{d + d^\dagger}{\sqrt{2}}, \quad b = \frac{d - d^\dagger}{\sqrt{2}i}.\end{aligned}\quad (8)$$

Now, by taking $L \rightarrow \infty$ and ignoring terms of $O(1/L)$, we obtain

$$H' \equiv U H U^\dagger = \bar{H}_0 + H_f + H_{sf} + H_{int} + \text{const},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{H}_0 &= \sum_{q>0} q b_{qc}^\dagger b_{qc} + \int dx : \Psi_s^\dagger i \partial_x \Psi_s(x) :, \\ H_f &= \int dx \left(\sum_{\alpha=1,2} \frac{i}{2} \xi_f^\alpha \partial_x \xi_f^\alpha + i V \xi_f^1 \xi_f^2 \right) \\ &\quad - i \sqrt{2\Gamma_{LR}} a \xi_f^2(0), \\ H_{sf} &= \int dx \sum_{\alpha=1,2} \frac{i}{2} \xi_{sf}^\alpha \partial_x \xi_{sf}^\alpha - i \sqrt{2\Gamma_+} b \xi_{sf}^1(0) \\ &\quad + i \sqrt{2\Gamma_-} a \xi_{sf}^2(0), \\ H_{int} &= ab \left\{ i \delta \lambda_1 : \Psi_s^\dagger \Psi_s(0) : - \delta \lambda_2 \xi_{sf}^1 \xi_{sf}^2(0) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \delta \lambda_3 \xi_{sf}^1 \xi_f^2(0) \right\}.\end{aligned}\quad (9)$$

Here $b_{qc} = \sqrt{2q/L} \int dx e^{iqx} \phi_c(x)$ ($q > 0$). $\Gamma_i = \lambda_{i\perp}^2 / (4\pi a_0)$ with $i = \pm, LR$. $\delta \lambda_1 = \lambda_{+\parallel} - 2\pi$, $\delta \lambda_2 = \lambda_{-\parallel}$, and $\delta \lambda_3 = \lambda_{LR\parallel}$. $\lambda_{\pm i} = (\lambda_{1i} \pm \lambda_{2i})/2$ with $i = \perp, \parallel$. Notice that for symmetric dots, $\Gamma_- = 0 = \delta \lambda_2$. The charge sector is completely decoupled from the impurities and we will not consider it hereafter. From Eq. (9), we see that the EK line corresponds to $\delta \lambda_i = 0$ ($i = 1, 2, 3$) and its Hamiltonian $H_f + H_{sf}$ can be solved exactly.

III. PHYSICAL OBSERVABLES

Now we are in a position to compute impurity contributions to the uniform magnetic susceptibility, which is defined by $\chi_{imp} = \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} (\partial M / \partial h|_{h=0} - L \chi_0) / L$ where χ_0 is the Pauli susceptibility of bulk electrons and $M = g \langle \hat{S}_T \rangle$ is the magnetization. (We consider the case with gyromagnetic ratios on the impurity site and bulk electrons being equal and denote it by g .) From Eq. (7) and the operator product expansion (OPE) of $\Psi_s^\dagger(z + ia)\Psi_s(z)$, we have $\hat{S}_T = \int dx : \Psi_s^\dagger \Psi_s(x) : + (P+1)/2$. The last term does not depend on the magnetic field h and we ignore it.

In the presence of external magnetic fields, there is an additional term in the Hamiltonian, $\Delta H = -gh\hat{S}_T$, which is invariant against the EK transformation. Performing the EK transformation and re-fermionization successively, we obtain the Hamiltonian describing noninteracting Ψ_s fermions as $H_s = \int dx : \Psi_s^\dagger (i \partial_x - gh) \Psi_s(x) :$.

The term linear in h can be removed by the transformation $\Psi_s(x) \rightarrow \Psi_s(x) e^{-ighx}$. As a result, $H_s \rightarrow \int dx : \Psi_s^\dagger i \partial_x \Psi_s(x) : + \text{const.}$ By noticing that $: \Psi_s^\dagger \Psi_s(x) : \rightarrow : \Psi_s^\dagger \Psi_s(x) : + gh/(2\pi)$, the magnetization becomes

$$M = g \int dx \langle : \Psi_s^\dagger \Psi_s(x) : \rangle + L \chi_0 h, \quad (10)$$

while H_{int} turns into $\bar{H}_{int} = H_{int} + i(gh/2\pi)\delta\lambda_1 ab$. It is straightforward to see that on the EK line the first term in Eq. (10) vanishes. This leads to $\chi_{imp} = 0$ and the leading contribution to χ_{imp} must arise from $\bar{H}_{int}$.⁸

To calculate contributions to χ_{imp} given by $\bar{H}_{int}$, we use the Keldysh formula.¹³ Before plunging into the calculation, we need impurity Green functions $G_a(\omega)$ and $G_b(\omega)$ on the EK line:

$$\begin{aligned}G_a(\omega) &= \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{\omega + i\Gamma_-} & -2i \frac{\Gamma_{LR}(n_V - \omega - n_{V+\omega}) + \Gamma_-(1 - 2n_\omega)}{\omega^2 + \Gamma_-^2} \\ 0 & \frac{1}{\omega - i\Gamma_-} \end{pmatrix}, \\ G_b(\omega) &= \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{\omega + i\Gamma_+} & -2i \frac{\Gamma_+(1 - 2n_\omega)}{\omega^2 + \Gamma_+^2} \\ 0 & \frac{1}{\omega - i\Gamma_+} \end{pmatrix},\end{aligned}\quad (11)$$

where $\bar{\Gamma} \equiv \Gamma_{LR} + \Gamma_-$ and n_ω is the Fermi distribution function. Here all Green functions are defined in the Keldysh space as

$$G = \begin{pmatrix} G_R & G_K \\ 0 & G_A \end{pmatrix}.$$

An important feature in Eq. (11) is that *in the presence of the cotunnelling term* ($\Gamma_{LR} \neq 0$) *a fermions are always screened by electrons in leads at low temperature* ($\ll \bar{\Gamma}$) *even for symmetric dots*. However, we shall see later that the interpretation of $\bar{\Gamma}$ depends on the ratio $|V|/\Gamma_+$. Finally, the bare Green functions of Ψ_s fermions are

$$G_s^0(\omega, p) = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{\omega + p + i0^+} & -2\pi i(1 - 2n_\omega)\delta(\omega + p) \\ 0 & \frac{1}{\omega + p - i0^+} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (12)$$

With the help of Eqs. (11) and (12) and $\bar{H}_{int}$, we are able to find that in the perturbative expansion of magnetization, the leading nonvanishing order is the one with $\delta\lambda_1^2$. It consists of two terms: one independent of h while the other proportional to h . The former becomes zero as $V = 0$ and it does not contribute to the magnetic susceptibility. Consequently, the latter gives the leading behavior of χ_{imp} at low temperature. After performing integrals over p and ω and in terms of digamma function $\psi(x)$, we have

$$\chi_{imp}(T, V) = \frac{(g\delta\lambda_1)^2}{4\pi^3} \frac{1}{\Gamma_+ - \bar{\Gamma}} (I_1 + I_2),$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}I_1 &= \psi\left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\Gamma_+}{2\pi T}\right) - \psi\left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\bar{\Gamma}}{2\pi T}\right), \\ I_2 &= \frac{\Gamma_{LR}}{\Gamma_+ + \bar{\Gamma}} \text{Re} \left\{ \psi\left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\Gamma_+ + iV}{2\pi T}\right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \psi\left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\bar{\Gamma} + iV}{2\pi T}\right) \right\}.\end{aligned}\quad (13)$$

Here $\text{Re}\{f(z)\}$ means the real part of $f(z)$. I_1 gives the result of the ordinary 2CK problem and Γ_+ plays the role of Kondo temperature T_K in that case without channel asymmetry. Effects of finite bias on χ_{imp} are through the function I_2 arising from scattering in the spin-flip cotunneling channel.

Based on Eq. (13) and in terms of the asymptotic formula of digamma function $\psi(z) = \ln z - 1/2z - 1/12z^2 + \dots$, we can discuss the low temperature behavior of χ_{imp} . It depends on the ratio $R \equiv \Gamma_+/\bar{\Gamma}$.

(i) $R = O(1)$. When $T \ll \Gamma_+, \bar{\Gamma}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &= \ln(\Gamma_+/\bar{\Gamma}) + O([T/\Gamma_+(\bar{\Gamma})]^2), \\ I_2 &\sim \ln f(V) + O((T/\epsilon_1)^2), \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

with $f(V) = \sqrt{(\Gamma_+^2 + V^2)/(\bar{\Gamma}^2 + V^2)}$. Here the crossover energy $\epsilon_1 = \Gamma_+(\bar{\Gamma})$ and $|V|$ for $|V| \ll \Gamma_+(\bar{\Gamma})$ and $|V| \gg \Gamma_+(\bar{\Gamma})$, respectively. Thus, the leading behavior of χ_{imp} is

$$\begin{aligned} \chi_{imp}(T, V) &= \frac{(g\delta\lambda_1)^2}{4\pi^3} \frac{1}{\Gamma_+ - \bar{\Gamma}} \left[\ln\left(\frac{\Gamma_+}{\bar{\Gamma}}\right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{\Gamma_{LR}}{\Gamma_+ + \bar{\Gamma}} \ln f(V) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

(ii) $R \gg 1$. When $\bar{\Gamma} \ll T \ll \Gamma_+$, we have

$$\chi_{imp}(T, V) = \frac{(g\delta\lambda_1)^2}{4\pi^3} (A/\Gamma_+) \ln(T_K^*/T), \quad (16)$$

with $T_K^* \approx T_K \{1 + [\Gamma_{LR}/2(\Gamma_+ + \bar{\Gamma})] \ln[1 + (\Gamma_+/V)^2]\}$ and T_K for $|V| \gg T$ and $|V| \ll T$, respectively. Here $A = 1, 1 + \Gamma_{LR}/(\Gamma_+ + \bar{\Gamma})$ for $|V| \gg T$ and $|V| \ll T$, respectively. $T_K = c\Gamma_+$ with $c = 2e^\gamma/\pi$ and γ being the Euler constant. Since $\Gamma_{LR}/\Gamma_+ \ll 1$, T_K^* is in general with the same order as T_K . For extremely low temperature $T \ll \bar{\Gamma}$, the behavior of χ_{imp} turns into that shown by Eq. (15). It is, however, a crossover not a phase transition. Equations (15) and (16) are the main results of this paper. We shall discuss their implications now.

IV. CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSIONS

Combined with perturbative analysis in Ref. 4, we arrive at the following picture: In the case with $\Gamma_+ \approx \bar{\Gamma}$, all couplings flow to the strong-coupling regime at low energy as $|V| \ll \Gamma_+$ and both a and b fermions are completely screened. It leads to 1CK behavior. This can also be understood by noticing that the two-lead Hamiltonian $H_f + H_{sf}$ in Eq. (9) has the structure of *two* copies of the 2CK problem where half of the impurity is screened by ψ_f and another half of the impurity is screened by ψ_{sf} , and the voltage acts only on ψ_f . (For simplicity, we take $\Gamma_- = 0$.) For $V \rightarrow 0$ and $T \ll \Gamma_{LR}, \Gamma_+$,

both channels will flow to strong couplings and the system manages itself into a single-channel Kondo problem, which can be easily seen by taking $\Gamma_+ = \Gamma_{LR}$ and rewriting the Hamiltonian through defining a new fermion $\psi = (1/\sqrt{2})(\xi_f^2 + i\xi_{sf}^1)$. On the other hand, for $|V| \gg \Gamma_+$, the flow of J_{LR} stops at the scale V while $J_{L,R}$ still continue to flow towards strong couplings without being affected by the voltage. This is the origin of the scale ϵ_1 appearing in Eq. (14). It also leads to the fact that the Majorana fermion a cannot be completely screened and fluctuates with a scale $\bar{\Gamma}$. Therefore, we expect that the 2CK behavior emerges in some situation as shown in Eq. (16). This in part explains the stability of this 2CK problem against the perturbation J_{LR} . It is, however, *not* exactly equivalent to an ordinary 2CK problem because the coupling J_{LR} below the scale V is not irrelevant but *marginal*. In other words, half of the impurity, the a fermion, can be viewed as a free fermion only at energy scales higher than $\bar{\Gamma}$. As the temperature is far below it, the impurity behaves as if it is completely screened.

The partially screened Majorana fermions also reveal themselves in the conductance:⁶

$$G(T, V) = G_U \frac{\bar{\Gamma}}{2\pi T} \text{Re} \left\{ \psi' \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\bar{\Gamma} + iV}{2\pi T} \right) \right\}, \quad (17)$$

where $\psi'(z) = d\psi/dz$ and $G_U = (\Gamma_{LR}/\bar{\Gamma})e^2/\pi$ is the conductance in the unitary limit. The low-temperature asymptotic behavior for $T \ll \bar{\Gamma}$ is

$$G(T, V) = G_U \frac{\bar{\Gamma}^2}{\bar{\Gamma}^2 + V^2} + O((T/\epsilon_2)^2), \quad (18)$$

with the crossover energy $\epsilon_2 = |V|$ and $\bar{\Gamma}$ for $|V| \gg \bar{\Gamma}$ and $|V| \ll \bar{\Gamma}$, respectively. From Eq. (18), we see that the conductance exhibits very different behaviors for large and small bias. For bias much smaller than the crossover energy $\bar{\Gamma}$, the conductance will reach the unitary limit, while for $V \gg \bar{\Gamma}$, the voltage plays the role of a crossover energy scale, and the conductance will saturate at a much smaller value than that in the unitary limit. Within the spirit of ‘‘poor man’s scaling,’’ we can extract scaling behaviors of the corresponding coupling: For $V \ll \bar{\Gamma}$, J_{LR} will flow towards strong coupling and completely screen the impurity. However, for $V \gg \bar{\Gamma}$, the RG flow will terminate at the scale V and the impurity can not be completely screened. Note that the scaling behavior of J_{LR} gained here is completely consistent with that obtained in Ref. 4. In addition, the asymptotic behavior of Eq. (18) is similar to that appearing in Ref. 3, which reveals the existence of some kind of universality in this nonequilibrium problem.

Concerning the possible experimental realization of the above-mentioned 2CK behavior, we need to be close enough to that quantum critical point. This requires a large ratio R for the renormalized scales, which is equivalent to the condition $J_{LR} \ll J_{L,R}$. However, it is very difficult to achieve this goal due to the constraint on the

bare couplings, $J_{LR}^2 \approx J_L J_R$, and the logarithmic nature of the RG flow. Thus, unless we can design a dot with a very small ratio for bare interlead and intralead tunnelings, it seems that this window is too narrow to observing the 2CK behavior.

Finally, we would like to mention that similar crossover behaviors, i.e., the 2CK behavior at the intermediate-temperature regime while the ordinary 1CK behavior in the extremely low-temperature regime, have already appeared in the context of channel-asymmetric 2CK problems.¹⁰ Although some technical details are not completely the same, the underlying physical reasons are similar — the appearance of a new energy scale suppresses some scattering processes and changes the direction of the RG flow. We would also like to point out that a recent paper by Zvyagin¹¹ discussed a similar problem but in a totally different physical context by using the Bethe ansatz. More precisely, Ref. 11 considers the low-energy properties of conduction electrons hybridized with localized $5f$ electrons. When the concentration of $5f$ electrons is low, the magnetic susceptibility exhibits a similar crossover behavior to our Eqs. (15) and (16). In that case, the new energy scale in addition to the Kondo temperature arises from the hybridization anisotropy. In a word, the most crucial difference between the models considered in Refs. 10 and 11 and the present one is that the appearance of two crossover scales in the former case is due to *channel anisotropy*, while in the latter case it is due to *the cotunneling processes*. The mechanisms to generate the new energy scale reveal their distinctions in

the channel-symmetric limit. In that limit, for the models considered in Refs. 10 and 11, the new crossover scale *vanishes* and the low-temperature dynamics is described by the *2CK fixed point*. On the contrary, for the Hamiltonian (1) in the channel-symmetric limit, the *two* crossover energy scales *never vanish*, and depending on the relative magnitude of the two scales (a large difference induced by large bias), the low-temperature dynamics is controlled either by the 2CK or 1CK fixed points. However, it always exhibits 1CK-type behaviors when the temperature is far below both scales.

To sum up, we arrive at the following conclusions: (i) *Regardless of the magnitude of bias V* , the low-temperature physics of quantum dots coupled to two leads is controlled by a *strong-coupling fixed point*. (ii) This strong-coupling fixed point should exhibit the behavior of a *one-channel Kondo fixed point* instead of a two-channel one. (iii) *There is a nearby two-channel Kondo fixed point located at the unphysical parameter space $\bar{\Gamma} = 0$* (in the sense that $\bar{\Gamma} = 0$ requires $J_{LR} = 0$). For dots with $\bar{\Gamma} \ll T_K$, *it controls the physics at the range of temperature $\bar{\Gamma} \ll T \ll T_K$* .

Acknowledgments

The work of Yu-Wen Lee is supported by the National Science Council of R.O.C. under Grant No. NSC89-2811-M002-0084.

-
- ¹ T. K. Ng and P. A. Lee, Phys. Rev. Lett. **61**, 1768 (1988) ; L. I. Glazman and M. E. Raikh, JETP Lett. **47**, 452 (1988).
 - ² D. Goldhaber-Gordon, *et al.*, Nature(London)**391**, 156 (1998) ; S. M. Cronenwett, *et al.*, Science **281**, 540, (1998).
 - ³ For a derivation of this Hamiltonian from the Anderson model through a *time-dependent* Schrieffer-Wolff transformation, see A. Kaminski, Yu. V. Nazarov, and L. I. Glazman, Phys. Rev. B **62**, 8154 (2000).
 - ⁴ P. Coleman, C. Hooley, and O. Parcollet, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 4088 (2001).
 - ⁵ X. G. Wen, cond-mat/9812431 (unpublished).
 - ⁶ A. Schiller and S. Hershfield, Phys. Rev. **B58**, 14 978 (1998)
 - ⁷ V. J. Emery and S. Kivelson, Phys. Rev. B **46**, 10 812 (1992).
 - ⁸ A. M. Sengupta and A. Georges, Phys. Rev. B **49**, 10 020 (1994).
 - ⁹ For mapping the Kondo Hamiltonian to a one-dimensional problem, see, for example, A. W. W. Ludwig, Int. J. Mod. Phys. B **8**, 347 (1994).

- ¹⁰ A similar Hamiltonian at zero-bias (equilibrium) and without the cotunneling term has been studied by M. Fabrizio, A. O. Gogolin, and Ph. Nozières, Phys. Rev. Lett. **74**, 4503 (1995) with bosonization and N. Andrei and A. Jerez, *ibid* **74**, 4507 (1995) with Bethe ansatz. However, the case they studied is distinct from the present one which is intrinsically a *non-equilibrium* problem due to the finite bias.
- ¹¹ A.A. Zvyagin, Phys. Rev B **63**, 014 503 (2000).
- ¹² For details of bosonization on a finite length, see J. von Delft and H. Schoeller, Ann. Phys. (Leipzig) **7**, 225 (1998). (cond-mat/9805275.) Its applications to two-channel Kondo problems can be found in G. Zaránd and J. von Delft, Phys. Rev. B **61**, 6918 (2000).
- ¹³ L.V. Keldysh, Zh. Éksp. Teor. Fiz. **47**, 1515 (1964) [Sov. Phys. JETP **20**, 1018 (1965)]. For discussions of the Keldysh formula, see, for example, A. M. Zagoskin, *Quantum Theory of Many-Body Systems* (Springer-Verlag New York, 1998) or M. Le Bellac, *Thermal Field Theory* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, England 1996).